

# WORLD SOCIETY IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY: SOME REFLECTIONS IN PHILOSOPHY

Dr. P. Vijandran<sup>1</sup>

## ABSTRACT

The millennium old world civilization has come across a plethora of clashes among different communities. Protective mechanisms in order to prevent those conflicts and clashes are scarce enough which ultimately led to heavy casualties across different phases of world society. There were a great amount of philosophers and statesman who tried to prevent these clashes. But still it persists. In the contemporary world, super national organisations and regional organisations to a large extent plays a quintessential role in order establish conflict less world. However the human community is suffering a lot due to the scour ages of war. War starts not in the battlefield, but it starts from the minds of the people stated by UNESCO. Individuals and their emancipation is the need of the hour in the contemporary world order. Individuals and nation states conflicts with one another on the bases viz., religion, ethnic, colour, and caste so on so forth. These bases are known for its sentimental composition which provokes the fellow humans to contradict with each other. Eastern philosophers and western bolsters various remedial steps in order to have ideal global order. Gandhism in India played pivotal role in shaping India and as well as Indians. Likewise each and every country has its own great social philosophers who fought for ideal order of human living. This piece of descriptive paper endeavours to scrutinize appropriate philosophical ideals in order to carve out ideal global order.

**Keywords:** Connflicts, Enlightenment, Emancipation, Ideal World Order, Self-Interest.

## INTRODUCTION

Since from the age of antiquity, conflicts among social beings are inherent which are harsh facts in the annals of the world history. The failure of state machinery in Afghanistan; civil strife in Iraq, religious terrorism, border disputes among nations targeting civilians are all the reflections which kindle questions on the very basis of the state. "Will not force is the basis of the state" enunciated by T.H Green, the celebrated philosopher of Great Britain. When we scrutinize the happenings of the recent past, force theory is being substantiated for the origin of state. Almost all the state and nation states are in different turmoil across the globe. Either it may be the belief system or non-belief system, or the reason which has to be pondered by scholars and exponents. Why states are clashing with one another? Is realist theory is the only option to study the international relations? Whether states are organised by force or will? Religion is good or bad? In the name of religion can war be substantiated? What are all the modes of globalization? Whether globalization do well for the developing and under developed nations? What changes has to be made in U.N.O? The impact of regional organizations in the world order. These afore-stated premises seems to be the "dialogic research" patronized by Socrates. Philosophers of such great kind without expectation of material benefits are always to be

---

<sup>1</sup> Controller of Examinations, Maduraikamarai university, Madurai-625021, Tamilnadu, India, phone: +91-452-2459122(O), fax: +91-452-2458788(O), mail id: [cemku@mkuniversity.org](mailto:cemku@mkuniversity.org)

applauded in great manner. But the moot point of the research problem is whether the existing world order is the one which was aimed by the ideal philosophers. The supremacy of U.S.A, nuclear amelioration, Globalization favouring developed nations, religious fundamentalism, defence expenditures, Missile technological developments, and Cybercrimes are various burning issues which has to be tackled over by the world governments and statesmen.

### **POLITICALLY ORGANISED SOCIETY**

“State exists for the happiness of its subjects” stated by Aristotle in politics. State was formed by the mutual contract among different types substantiated by Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau. Although these contractualists differed in their viewpoints regarding the human nature, they opined same in the existence of the state. It is to prevent them from the strong community, the weaker fought for the contract and thus the outcome was the politically organised society. But the question is whether the modern world is safe and secured or not. Locke opined in “Two treatises of government” that men surrendered all rights except right to life, liberty and property. If these rights are not protected by the state, then people have utmost right to revolt against the existing government. Modern and recent revolution in Libya Egypt, Tunisia are all the evidences for the Locke's theses. But on the other hand we cannot give full assurance for the democratic form of governance. In India during 1970's emergency was declared which curtailed several rights of the people.

Ironically the emergency era was highly applauded by non-political subjects who favoured the direct rule. Each and every type of governance has its own limitations. Only thing to hope is the ruling body which should be a composition of ideal rulers as mentioned by Plato in his “Republic”. The concept of the philosopher king is a unique and as well as apt remedy for the existing mis-governance or wrong governance. In Indian constitution the founding fathers believed that the smooth functioning of the governance depends upon not the code of conduct but rulers who implement the one. We may find any number of lapses in democratic governance also. For the past 67 years and above, India is considered as a largest democracy along with U.S.A., but in the sector of poverty eradication, literacy and political education, India is lagging behind for the reason which is unknown. Democracy as such is having its quintessential elements, such as liberty equality and fraternity which was slanted as slogan during the French revolution in 1789. These afore stated principles and its implications in the developed and under developing countries raises series of controversies. Arab and African countries protested against dictatorial regimes in order to establish democratic governance in their own. But almost all the countries are facing unstable conditions, since political chaos prevailed in these nations. “People gets the government what it deserves” said by Jefferson and obviously the statement is proved in all these nations.

### **RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC IMBROGLIO**

The predominant struggle among the nations of the world at present is on the basis of religion and ethnic components. Religion, obviously is a controlling and coordinating factor between different groups but in the name of religion and its misinterpretations, there are untold and unprecedented events that are happening in the world. Religious based terrorism and its counterpart pose always a great threat for the survival of the entire human community. Marx opined that “religion is an opium”. The radical feature expressed by Marx has to be scrutinized to a large extent. 100's and 1000's of people are killed and massacred every day in Iraq, Afghanistan and Palestine for the well-known cause. Metaphysically there is no strong or

concrete substantial for the existence of super natural power. Even though it is a hard fact, nobody can deny that religion plays a vital role in the day to day human life and relationships. Voltaire sustained that “if there is no religion in this world I will create a new one”. Thus religion make peaceful minds and that is the ultimate motto of every human life. The mis- guided and mis- interpreted religious ideals makes various group to clash with one another thus causing a great setback for human efforts to establish perpetual peace. Political leadership is the main gamut that has to be purified or philosophized in order to establish peace. Eternal peace was the main motto of Kant’s political philosophy which serves as a main ideal for all statesmen in this world

### **MORAL INTERNATIONAL ORDER**

Morals and ethical principles are the controlling contrivance for in order to have ideal global order. Like international law, the world order does not have international or universal moral principles U.N.O and its specialized agencies are doing yeomen services to the entire humanity but the organization is having its own limitations and restrictions. “Universal moral constitution” can be made out by getting consensus from among the nations of general assembly. Among all the existing moral principles Mazzini’s “humanitarian nationalism can be incorporated as valuable additions. The IVth general principles goes this way “every mission constitutes a pledge of duty and everyman is bound to consecrate his every faculty to its fulfilment. He will desire his rule of action from the profound conviction of that duty. The duty oriented performance is also the single motto of Hindu religion i.e., “Bhagawat gita”. Do your duty and expect not the result is the main tenet of Hindu religion

Every act of egotism is a violation of fraternity says the 13<sup>th</sup> general principle. Ego tic attitude and the subsequent performance either by individual or nations ends in devastating effects. The first prime minister of India said that “we must have self-interest that must be an enlightened self-interest. Enlightened self-interest circumvents around common interest which should be prioritised.

According to 17<sup>th</sup> principle “every people has its special mission, which will cooperate towards the fulfilment of the general mission of humanity. That mission constitutes its nationality.

Nationality is sacred. General mission or which is good for all be given higher status. The world community may think of the world order by which no individual or nation should suffer with any kind of common essentialities.

And the 19<sup>th</sup> principle says, “humanity will only be truly constituted when all the peoples of which it is composed have acquired the free exercise of their sovereignty, and shall be associated in a republican confederation governed directed by a common declaration of principles and a common pact, towards the common aim the discovery and fulfilment of the universal moral law.

### **PERPETUAL PEACE BY KANT**

The law of nations ought to be founded upon a federation of Free states. Nations, as states, like individuals, if they live in a state of nature and without laws, by their vicinity alone commit an act of lesion. One may, in order to secure its own safety, require of another to establish within it a

constitution which should guarantee to all their rights. This would be a federation of nations, without the people however forming one and the same state, the idea of a state supposing the relation of a sovereign to the people, of a superior to his inferiors. Now several nations, united into one state, would no longer form but one; which contradicts the supposition, the question here being of the reciprocal rights of nations, inasmuch as they compose a multitude of different states, which ought not to be incorporated into one and the same state.

But when we see savages in their anarchy, prefer the perpetual combats of licentious liberty to a reasonable liberty, founded upon constitutional order, can we refrain to look down with the most profound contempt on this animal degradation of humanity? Must we not blush at the contempt to which the want of civilization reduces men? And would one not rather be led to think that civilized nations, each of which form a constituted state, would hasten to extricate themselves from an order of things so ignominious? But what, on the contrary, do we behold? Every state placing its majesty (for it is absurd to talk of the majesty of the people) precisely in this independence of every constraint of any external legislation whatever.

The sovereign places his glory in the power of disposing at his pleasure (without much exposing himself) of many millions of men, ever ready to sacrifice themselves for an object that does not concern them. The only difference between the savages of America and those of Europe, is, that the former have eaten up many a hostile tribe, whereas the latter have known how to make a better use of their enemies; they preserve them to augment the number of their subjects, that is to say, of instruments destined to more extensive conquests. When we consider the perverseness of human nature, which shews itself unveiled and unrestrained in the relations of nations with each other, where it is not checked, as in a state of civilization, by the coercive power of the law, one may well be astonished that the word has not yet been totally abolished from war-politics and that a state has not yet been found bold enough openly to profess this doctrine. For hitherto Grotius, Pufendorf, Wattel, and other useless and impotent defenders of the rights of nations, have been constantly cited in justification of war; though their code, purely philosophic or diplomatic, has never had the force of law, and cannot obtain it; states not being as yet subjected to any coercive power. There is no instance where their reasoning's, supported by such respectable authorities, have induced a state to desist from its pretensions. However this homage which all states render to the principle of right, if even consisting only in words, is a proof of a moral disposition, which, though still slumbering, tends nevertheless vigorously to subdue in man that evil principle, of which he cannot entirely divest himself. For otherwise states would never pronounce the word right, when going to war with each other; it were then ironically, as a Gallic prince interpreted it. "It is," said he, "the prerogative nature has given to the stronger, to make himself obeyed by the weaker."

However, the field of battle is the only tribunal before which states plead their cause; but victory, by gaining the suit, does not decide in favour of their cause. Though the treaty of peace puts an end to the present war, it does not abolish a state of war (a state where continually new pretences for war are found); which one cannot affirm to be unjust, since being their own judges, they have no other means of terminating their differences. The law of nations cannot even force them, as the law of nature obliges individuals to get free from this state of war, since having already a legal constitution, as states, they are secure against every foreign compulsion, which might tend to establish among them a more extended constitutional order.

Since, however, from her highest tribunal of moral legislation, reason without exception condemns war as a mean of right, and makes a state of peace an absolute duty; and since this

peace cannot be effected or be guaranteed without a compact among nations, they must form an alliance of a peculiar kind, which might be called a pacific alliance (*foedits pacificum*) different from a treaty of peace (*pactum pads*) inasmuch as it would forever terminate all wars, whereas the latter only finishes one. This alliance does not tend to any dominion over a state, but solely to the certain maintenance of the liberty of each particular state, partaking of this association, without being therefore obliged to submit, like men in a state of nature, to the legal constraint of public force. It can be proved, that the idea of a federation, which should insensibly extend to all states, and thus lead them to a perpetual peace, may be realized. For if fortune should so direct, that a people as powerful as enlightened, should constitute itself into a republic (a government which in its nature inclines to a perpetual peace) from that time there would be a centre for this federative association; other states might adhere thereto, in order to guarantee their liberty according to the principles of public right; and this alliance might insensibly be extended. That a people should say, "There shall not be war among us: we will form ourselves into a state; that is to say, we will ourselves establish a legislative, executive, and judiciary power, to decide our differences," can be conceived.

But if this state should say, "There shall not be war between us and other states, although we do not acknowledge a supreme power, that guarantees our reciprocal rights"; upon what then can this confidence in one's rights be founded, except it is upon this free federation, this supplement of the social compact, which reason necessarily associates with the idea of public right?

The expression of law of nations, taken in a sense of right of war, presents properly no idea to the mind; since thereby is understood a power of deciding right, not according to universal laws, which restrain within the same limits all individuals, but according to partial maxims, namely, by force. Except one would wish to insinuate by this expression, that it is right, that men who admit such principles should destroy each other, and thus find perpetual peace only in the vast grave that swallows them and their iniquities.

At the tribunal of reason, there is but one mean of extricating states from this turbulent situation, in which they are constantly menaced with war; namely, to renounce, like individuals, the anarchic liberty of savages, in order to submit themselves to coercive laws, and thus form a society of nations (*cwitas gentium*) which would insensibly embrace all the nations of the earth. But as the ideas which they have of the law of nations, absolutely prevent the realization of this plan, and make them reject in practice what is true in theory, there can only be substituted, to the positive idea of an universal republic (if all is not to be lost) the negative supplement of a permanent alliance, which prevents war, insensibly spreads, and stops the torrent of those unjust-and inhuman passions, which always threaten to break down this fence.

## SUMMARY

The world order and its impact is entirely hinges upon the individual order. All the above-mentioned Mazzini's and Kant's humanitarian philosophy portrays for the sake of holistic development of individual as a community. Conflicts are permanent. Clashes are a cursed phenomenon. Religion is a must for the civilized development of individual and groups. Religion is an integrating factor of mind and as well as groups. Ethnic segregation should be approached with an enlightened vision of human mind. These theses can be substantiated by the following founding truths of Aurobindo and Lord Emerson.

- Non-duality is the highest metaphysical truth
- The world is the real and joyful manifestation of spirit's blessing
- The soul evolves spiritually through the divine process of life itself
- Life's purpose is to surrender to divine power and realize non-duality
- Awakening transforms the soul into a perfect instrument for cosmic will in perfect harmony with all for creation.
- Terrestrial evolution is the progressive revelation of spirit
- Evolution is advancing inevitably toward the realization of the life divine here on earth.

## REFERENCES

- Bertrand Russell (1989) A history of western philosophy, Australia: Allen & Unwin, p.no 101
- Michael Nicholson (2005) International relations, New York: Macmillan, p.no 212-213.
- William Bernstein (1970): Modern political thought New Delhi: p.no 334-337.
- Ibid: p.no 130-135.
- Lester Pearson (1955): democracy in world politics, Princeton: Princeton University press p.no 82-83.
- Aaron Friedberg (1994): "the future of American power" political science quarterly, 109, p.no 15.
- Samuel Huntington (1996): the clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order, New Delhi: penguin publishers, p.no 67-69.
- Frederick Iyengar (1930) Emerson and Asia, Cambridge: Harvard university press, p.no 11-13
- Smith (1834): life and writings of Joseph Mazzini, Elder & Co.
10. Noam Chomsky (2012): How the world works, London, penguin publishers, p.no 206-208.